

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,919	09/20/2000	Venkatachari Dilip	CE1-002US	8530
29150	7590 11/30/2006	•	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES, PLLC 421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE, STE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201		WEISBERGER, RICHARD C		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
J. J	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	·	3693	
			DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/665,919	DILIP ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Richard C. Weisberger	3693					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover shee	et with the correspondence a	address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMU 1.136(a). In no event, however, mand of will apply and will expire SIX (6) to te, cause the application to become	JNICATION. ay a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this ne ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
,	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)	/ _							
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims	,	,					
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>73-89</u> is/are pending in the application.							
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed							
•	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
,	8) Claim(s) 73-89 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers							
<i>a</i> /□	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
,	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	an priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
-7.	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	iority documents have b	een received in this Nationa	al Stage				
	application from the International Bure	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
	•							
Attachmen	t(s)							
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		iew Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:								

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

the third-party system holding the funds from the debit transaction in ml
intermediate account owned by the third-party system at a third financial institution;
 and

in a second part of the transaction, the third-party system executing a credit transaction with a second financial institution to deposit the funds in an account at the second financial institution.

2. in a first transaction, a third-party financial management system executing a debit transaction with a first financial institution: comprising withdrawing funds from a first account owned by the user at the first financial institution;

the third-party system holding the funds from the debit transaction ha an intermediate account owned by the third-pan3, system; and

in a second transaction, the third-party system executing a credit transaction with a second financial institution, comprising depositing the funds in a second account owned by the user at the second financial institution.

3. in a first transaction, a third-party financial management system executing a debit transaction with. a first financial institution, comprising withdrawing funds from a fu's; account owned by the user at the first Financial institution;

the third-patty system holding the funds from the debit transaction in an intermediate account owned by the third-patty system; and

in a second transaction, the third-patty system executing a credit transaction

with a second financial institution, comprising depositing the funds in a second account at the second financial institution, wherein the second account is owned by someone other than the user.

4. a financial management system maintaining customer information for a plurality of customers, the customer information for each of the plurality of customers comprising, customer identification information; and account identification information for each of a plurality of customer accounts at each. of the plurality of financial institutions;

The species are independent or distinct because they have different effects

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Currently, none is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

A telephone call was made to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Application/Control Number: 09/665,919

Page 4

Art Unit: 3693

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Richard Weisberger

571 272 6753